DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 629 EM 010 714

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Bunderson, C. Victor; And Others |
| TITLE | The Interaction of Reasoning and Memory Abilities with Rule-Example Vs. Discovery Instruction in Learning an Imaginary Science. Technical Report Number 3. |
| INSTITUTION | Texas Univ., Austin. Computer-Assisted Instruction Lab. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. Personnel and Training Research Programs Office. |
| PUB DATE | Aug 71 |
| NOTE | 22p.; ARPA Project on Cognitive Abilities and Learning |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Cognitive Processes; Computer Assisted Instruction; *Discovery Learning; *Individual Differences; Instructional Design; Memory; Task Analysis; *Teaching Methods; Transfer of Training |

ABSTRACT

Two experiments were conducted to investigate the relationships between individual difference variables and discovery vs. non-discovery instructional treatments in learning of an imaginary science. All subjects were able to learn the material, but presentation of examples and rules (non-discovery) led to more rapid learning. There was no difference between the two treatments on transfer to a higher-order task, although such a difference would have been predicted by the learning-by-discovery hypothesis. However, an interaction between treatment and reasoning ability combined with a floor effect on the number of examples to criterion measure leaves open the possibility that discovery learning may still show advantages, if only for individuals high in reasoning ability. (RH)

ED 072629

# THE INTERACTION OF REASONING AND MEMORY ABILITIES WITH RULE-EXAMPLE VS. DISCOVERY INSTRUCTION IN LEARNING AN IMAGINARY SCIENCE

C. Victor Bunderson
Paul F. Merrill
William P. Olivier

*TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 3*

*August 1971*

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

*PROJECT ON COGNITIVE ABILITIES AND LEARNING*
*Sponsored By*
*Advanced Research Projects Agency*
*ARPA Order No. 1261*
*Contract N00014-67-A-0126-0006*
*Program Code No.: NR 154-282/8-13-68 Code 458*

*This research was sponsored by the Personnel and Training Research Programs, Psychological Sciences Division, Office of Naval Research, Washington, D. C. Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government. This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.*

*Co-Principal Investigators:*
*C. V. Bunderson and J. L. Dunham*

*THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN*
*Computer-Assisted Instruction Laboratory*
*Austin, Texas 78712*

CG 010 714

Unclassified

Security Classification

## DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D

*Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified*

| 1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author) | 2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION |
|---|---|
| Advanced Research Projects Agency<br>Washington, D.C. 20301 | Unclassified |
| | 2b. GROUP |

3. REPORT TITLE

THE INTERACTION OF REASONING AND MEMORY ABILITIES WITH RULE-EXAMPLE VS. DISCOVERY INSTRUCTION IN LEARNING AN IMAGINARY SCIENCE

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and, inclusive dates)

Technical Report No. 3, August 1971

5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)

C. Victor Bunderson, Paul F. Merrill, William P. Olivier

| 6. REPORT DATE | 7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES | 7b. NO. OF REFS |
|---|---|---|
| August 1971 | 22 | 13 |

| 8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. | 9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) |
|---|---|
| N00014-67-A-0126-0006 | |
| b. PROJECT NO.<br>NR 154-282/8-13-68 Code 458 | |
| c. | 9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)<br>Technical Report No. 3 |
| d. | |

10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES | 12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY |
|---|---|
| | U. S. Department of the Navy<br>Office of Naval Research<br>Washington, D. C. |

13. ABSTRACT

| 14 KEY WORDS | LINK A | | LINK B | | LINK C | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ROLE | WT | ROLE | WT | ROLE | WT |
| | | | | | | |

# THE INTERACTION OF REASONING AND MEMORY ABILITIES WITH RULE-EXAMPLE VS DISCOVERY INSTRUCTION IN LEARNING AN IMAGINARY SCIENCE

## INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant discussions of the learning by discovery issue is found in the publication (Shulman & Keislar, 1966) of the proceedings of a conference on Learning by Discovery, sponsored by the Committee on Learning and the Educational Process of the Social Science Research Council. Although each paper presented at the conference was relevant to the learning by discovery issue, two of the papers were especially relevant to research on learning by discovery. Wittrock (1966) discussed the issues and problems associated with the learning by discovery hypothesis as proposed by Bruner (1961) and reviewed several representative studies in detail. He stated that it was very difficult to derive any general conclusions from the data because of the wide variety of dependent variables used and the lack of operationally defined treatments. He stressed that it is futile to expect one method of learning to be consistently superior to all others using a variety of subject matter and Ss from different populations. He suggested that future studies should take into account the history and individual differences of the Ss and that investigators should search for alternatives to the all-or-none position. He further recommended that treatments should be designed to vary only one element at a time and that the treatments should differ in a systematic and meaningful way.

Additional recommendations relevant to future studies on learning by discovery were made in Cronbach's (1966) conference paper. He argued that learning tasks used in future research should have psychological properties similar to those of educational subject matter. Thus, he discouraged the use of tasks in which the S-R linkage was arbitrary and recommended that the principles or rules of a learning task should fit into a system of supporting propositions. He also suggested that interactions of pupil characteristics with treatments on multiple outcomes should be investigated. He observed that most of the research on learning by discovery is confounded because of an experimental design dilemma. If each S in both the discovery and the expository treatment groups is trained to the same performance criterion, the discovery Ss may require more time and examples to reach the criterion. The treatments would therefore be confounded because of the differential content and time received by each S. On the other hand, if the experimental design equates time and content for each S, scores on retention and transfer measures may be confounded by nondiscoverers or overlearners.

It is impossible to follow all of the recommendations and to solve all the problems mentioned above in any single experimental study. However, the investigator should be aware of which supposed research requirements are satisfied and which have not been satisfied; then, the results of any study should be interpreted and qualified accordingly.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relationships between individual difference variables and discovery vs. non-discovery instructional treatments. Both Wittrock (1966) and Cronbach (1966) suggested that future studies should investigate the relationships between pupil characteristics and instructional treatments. Cronbach and Snow (1969) reported the results of a pilot study conducted by Jane Stallings which investigated the relationships between psycholinguistic and memory abilities and a phonics vs. look-say reading instruction treatments. The results showed that high ability Ss obtained high reading achievement scores when assigned to a look-say treatment, while low ability Ss obtained high reading achievement scores when assigned to a phonics treatment. Cronbach and Snow (1969) argued that "if these results can be substantiated, then the age-old battle about which of these reading methods is the 'one best way' seems a very hollow fight." Therefore, as suggested by Wittroch (1966), this study was conducted to provide an alternative to the all-or-none position on learning by discovery and search for relationships between treatments and individual differences.

Earlier studies by Bunderson (1967) and Dunham, Guilford and Hoepfner (1968) have demonstrated strong relationships between task performance and cognitive ability measures, while studies by Dunham and Bunderson (1969) and those reported by Cronbach and Snow (1969) have revealed that relationships between task performance and abilities may be altered by manipulating a task variable.

In a pilot study (Bunderson, Olivier, & Merrill, 1971), the feasibility of using an imaginary science adapted for presentation on the IBM 1500 computer-assisted instruction (CAI) system as a learning task for investigating learning by discovery variables was evaluated. By following a task analysis procedure outlined by Gagné (1961), a hierarchy of 13 rules for the science were developed, and a series of tabular displays to be generated by the computer was selected to serve as examples of each rule. The Ss were 51 students enrolled in science education classes at The University of Texas at Austin, who were randomly assigned to an example-only, or discovery, treatment group and a rule-example, or non-discovery, treatment group. All Ss received additional examples of a rule until they were able to pass constructed response test items on the rule. Before learning the task, all Ss were given a battery of cognitive tests designed to measure the abilities of induction, associative memory, and general reasoning. The groups differed only on the number of examples required

to learn the science, $F(1,49) = 9.087$, $p < .01$, with more examples being required by the example-only group. There were no significant differences between the groups on the post, retention, or transfer tests. The battery of cognitive tests were factor analyzed, and a two-factor Varimax solution was obtained yielding the factors of reasoning and associative memory. Regression analyses of the factor scores and the criterion measures were conducted. A significant disordinal interaction, $F(1,47) = 7.272$, $p < .01$, between the associative memory factor scores and the treatments, using number of examples as criterion, was found. This analysis revealed that Ss with high memory scores in the rule-example group required few examples, while Ss with low memory in the example-only groups required few examples. There were no significant interactions with the reasoning factor scores. In addition to the results cited above, this pilot study revealed that Ss required an excessive amount of time to learn the science, while their level of performance on the posttest was mediocre. Several of the rules were too difficult, and many Ss needed help and encouragement to complete the task. It was also found that the generation of the tabular displays, which served as examples of the rules, required an excessive amount of computer time and was distracting to the Ss. (The algorithm used to generate these displays used the integer arithmetic capabilities of Coursewriter II, and was very inefficient.) The generation of the tables also made it necessary to require Ss to make selected observations and record them in a workbook to focus their attention on relevant parts of a given table. Copying this information, of course, became quite tedious.

Based on the findings of the pilot study, the imaginary science and experimental procedure were revised, and the studies reported in this paper were subsequently conducted using the revised version of the science.

## METHOD

### *Experiment I*

#### *Subjects*

The 30 Ss who participated in this study were enrolled in two sections of a science education course at The University of Texas at Austin. The Ss were required to participate as a class assignment.

#### *Ability Measures*

Seven cognitive ability tests were selected from the Kit of Reference Tests for Cognitive Factors (French, Ekstrom, & Price, 1963) to measure the abilities expected to be related to task performance. The

Object-Number Test and the First and Last Names Test were selected to measure associative memory. Inductive reasoning was measured by the Letter Sets Test and the Locations Test. The Ship Destination Test, Necessary Arithmetic Operations Test, and Mathematics Aptitude Test were chosen to measure general reasoning.

*Experimental Task, Materials, and Equipment*

The learning task used in this study was a revised version of the imaginary science called the Science of Xenograde Systems. The use of an imaginary science assured that all Ss would have had no previous experience with the task, thus eliminating the necessity of pretesting and discarding Ss who might be familiar with the task content. With prior knowledge of the task principles held constant, the source of individual differences could, with greater confidence, be attributed solely to Ss' different abilities and learning styles. Since the principles of the science were interrelated and similar in structure and content to formal science topics, the recommendation by Cronbach (1966) that the experimental task should have psychological properties similar to those of subject matter taught in the schools was followed.

The science was conceived by Carl Bereiter at the Training Research Laboratory, University of Illinois, and was expanded and developed by David Merrill (1964). Merrill's version of the science was simplified and revised, and an instructional program for presenting the task on the IBM 1500 computer-assisted instruction system was designed according to the instructional design model developed by Bunderson (1969).

In the revised version of the science used in this study, a Xenograde System consists of a satellite which revolves around a nucleus. The satellite and nucleus contain particles called alphons. The laws and relationships between the components of the system as a function of time and initial conditions comprise the subject matter of the task. The terminal objective of the task requires the Ss to predict the state of a Xenograde System for each unit of time from time zero to a specified time when given the initial conditions of the system. Operationally, this consisted of filling in a table of readings called a Xenograde table. Ten rules for the revised science and the hierarchical sequence for presenting the rules were determined by an analysis of an efficient information-processing algorithm for performing the terminal behavior. A complete description of this analysis procedure and the design of the initial program may be found in Bunderson, Olivier, and Merrill (1971).

The materials used in the instructional program consisted of statements of ten rules, five examples for each rule, and five short constructed response tests for each rule. The examples were in the form

of partial Xenograde tables which demonstrated the activity of the Xenograde System components at several points in time. The short tests each contained three constructed response items which required Ss to apply the corresponding rule in order to make a correct prediction concerning the state of a Xenograde System at a given point in time.

The examples and test items were displayed on the cathode ray tube (CRT) of the IBM 1510 instructional terminal, while the Ss responded to the test items by means of a typewriter keyboard on the terminal. It should be noted that the examples for this revised version of the science were stored and displayed rather than generated by an algorithm as was done in the pilot study described earlier. Thus, the portions of the table irrelevant to the rule could be omitted from the display. The statements of the rules were displayed on the IBM 1512 image projector terminal. The instructional program was written in the Coursewriter II language and presented by the IBM 1500/1800 CAI system. The use of the CAI system made it possible to present and withdraw any display at random under program control, to record accurate display and response latencies, and to record and score each student response.

A printed instruction booklet was also provided which contained an introduction to the science, the purpose and justification of the course, instructions on reading Xenograde tables, and a treatment-specific explanation of the procedure for learning the task. Samples of the booklet, examples, rules, and test items may be found in Bunderson et al. (1971).

*Post and Retention Tests*

The post and retention tests were parallel forms which required Ss to fill in entries of a Xenograde table given the initial conditions of the system. These measures were presented on the CRT terminals. In order to prevent cumulative errors, Ss were given corrective feedback after making entries for a complete line of the table.

*Transfer Task*

The transfer task consisted of a booklet containing two Xenograde tables which served as examples of three higher-order rules of the science, not yet encountered by the Ss. The Ss were required to infer the rules from these examples and to apply the inferred rules in making predictions concerning the state of a Xenograde system at a given point in time. There were a total of nine test items with three items for each rule.

*Procedure*

In order to increase the interest and motivation of the Ss in the task, a short lecture was presented by E which explained the value of participation in the study and gave an introduction to CAI and ability by treatment

interaction studies. Following the lecture, all Ss were given the battery of cognitive tests and were then instructed to schedule a two-hour session at the CAI Laboratory to learn the Xenograde Science.

The Ss were randomly assigned to two treatment groups: an example-only group and a rule-example group. All Ss were given the instruction booklet before learning the science. The Ss in the rule-example group were presented with a display of a statement of the first rule on the image projector. A Xenograde table which served as an example of the rule was simultaneously displayed on the CRT. After studying the rule and example, the Ss responded to a three-item constructed response test requiring them to predict certain values using the rule. If two of the three items were answered correctly, S was given the next rule of the science; otherwise, he was given another example of the same rule and another three-item test. This sequence of new examples followed by response tests continued until S had answered correctly two of the three items or had received five examples. The task was completed after all ten rules of the science had been learned. The Ss in the example-only group learned the science by the same basic procedure, except no statement of the rule was provided. The Ss in this group were required to infer their own rule from the example(s) presented. Following completion of the task, all Ss were given the posttest and were scheduled to take the retention and transfer tests two weeks later. The results of this study are reported below in connection with the results of a replication experiment.

## *Experiment II*

Since only 20 Ss completed all phases of the first experiment, a second experiment was conducted to replicate the first one. The data from the first experiment revealed that the revised version of the task was an appropriate vehicle for studying ability by treatment interactions in learning by discovery (Bunderson et al., 1971). Therefore, the same task, materials, and procedure were used in Experiment II. An additional 53 Ss from science education classes participated in this study. However, not all Ss completed all phases of the study, and data from a few Ss were lost because of computer malfunctions.

### *Results*

Since Experiment II was an exact replication of Experiment I, the results of both studies are presented in this section, along with the results obtained when data from both studies were combined. In addition to the scores obtained on the cognitive ability tests, the posttest, retention test, and transfer test, data were obtained on the total number of examples each S received.

The means and standard deviations for each criterion variable for Experiment I, Experiment II, and the combined data of both experiments are found in Table 1. The differences between the posttest means were not significant in either Experiment I or II. However, when the data were combined, a significant difference, $F(1,77) = 3.867$, $p < .05$, in favor of the rule-example group was obtained between the posttest means. Although the group retention test means were not significantly different in Experiment II, but they were in Experiment I, $F(1,16) = 4.588$, $p < .05$, and also when the data were combined, $F(1,65) = 8.331$, $p < .01$. In each case, the rule group means were greater than the example-only group means. There were no significant differences between the transfer test group means for either experiment or for the combined data. The groups differed on the number of examples required to learn the science [Experiment I: $F(1,28) = 11.983$, $p < .01$; Experiment II: $F(1,48) = 20.436$, $p < .001$; combined data: $F(1,78) = 30.926$, $p < .001$], with more examples required by the example-only group in both experiments and with combined data.

Separate factor analyses were conducted on the ability test scores from each experiment, and a third factor analysis was conducted on the ability tests scores from both experiments combined. In each case, a two-factor Varimax solution was obtained yielding the factors of reasoning and associative memory. Since the three solutions were very similar, only the factor matrix for the combined data is found in Table 2. The First and Last Names Test and the Object Number Test loaded on the associative memory factor, while the induction and general reasoning tests all loaded on the reasoning factor.

Regression analyses of the factor scores and the criterion measures were conducted for each experiment and for the combined data. A significant interaction, [Experiment I: $F(1,26) = 4.839$, $p < .05$; Experiment II: $F(1,46) = 11.158$, $p < .01$; combined data: $F(1,76) = 19,274$, $p < .001$] of reasoning factor scores with example-only vs. rule-example treatments using number of examples as criterion was found for both experiments and the combined data. Figure 1 is a plot of the regression lines for the combined data. (Corresponding plots for Experiment I and II were very similar.) Figure 1 shows that the number of examples required to learn the science has a high negative relationship to reasoning for Ss in the example-only group, while number of examples has little or no relationship to reasoning for Ss in the rule-example group.

There were no significant interactions between the treatments and memory factor scores using data from the separate experiments, but a memory-by-treatment interaction approached significance, $F(1,76) = 3.850$, $p < .10$, when the data were combined. Figure 2 is a plot of the regression lines for the combined data, and from this figure it can be seen that the relationship between memory and the treatments was very similar to that of reasoning (Figure 1).

*Table 1*

Group Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Examples, Posttest, Retention Test, and Transfer Test

| *Group* | *Number of Examples* | | | *Post Test* | | | *Retention Test* | | | *Transfer Test* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *N* | *Mean* | *SD* | *N* | *Mean* | *SD* | *N* | *Mean* | *SD* | *N* | *Mean* | *SD* |
| | | | | | *Experiment I* | | | | | | | |
| Example-Only | 14 | 14.0 | 3.6 | 14 | 88.8 | 6.3 | 10 | 91.9 | 5.3 | 10 | 4.6 | 1.8 |
| Rule-Example | 16 | 10.7 | .84 | 16 | 92.4 | 7.0 | 8 | 96.5 | 2.3 | 10 | 5.6 | 1.7 |
| | | | | | *Experiment II* | | | | | | | |
| Example-Only | 24 | 16.0 | 5.6 | 22 | 88.8 | 10.0 | 22 | 92.8 | 4.7 | 21 | 5.5 | 1.6 |
| Rule-Example | 26 | 10.8 | 1.2 | 27 | 92.8 | 9.2 | 27 | 95.4 | 4.1 | 25 | 5.2 | 2.2 |
| | | | | | *Combined data from Experiments I & II* | | | | | | | |
| Example-Only | 38 | 15.3 | 5.1 | 36 | 88.8 | 8.8 | 32 | 92.5 | 4.9 | 31 | 5.2 | 1.8 |
| Rule-Example | 42 | 10.8 | 1.1 | 43 | 92.6 | 8.4 | 35 | 95.6 | 3.8 | 35 | 5.3 | 2.1 |

*Table 2*

Varimax Rotation Factor Matrix* on Combined Data

| *Tests* | *Factor loadings* | |
|---|---|---|
| | *Reasoning Factor* | *Associative Memory Factor* |
| Object Number (MA) | 03 | 87 |
| First Last Names (MA) | 11 | 87 |
| Locations (I) | 66 | 11 |
| Letter Sets (I) | 70 | 16 |
| Ship Destination (R) | 87 | 09 |
| Necessary Arithmetic Operations (R) | 76 | 06 |
| Mathematics Aptitude (R) | 74 | -11 |

*Decimal points omitted.




Figure 1.--Interaction of Reasoning Factor Scores and Treatments with Number of Examples as Criterion.




Figure 2.--Interaction of Memory Factor Scores and Treatments with Number of Examples as Criterion.

## DISCUSSION

The experimental procedure used in the two studies reported here required that all Ss reach a minimum criterion performance on each rule before they proceeded to learn the succeeding rule. By using this procedure, it was expected that both treatment groups would perform equally well on the terminal criterion measure. This expectation was supported when the data from the studies were analyzed separately, but an analysis of the combined data revealed a significant difference between the posttest means. The differences between retention test means were also not consistent across all three analyses. The retention test differences were consistently in the same direction, but only two of the three analyses revealed significant differences. The reason for these inconsistent findings on the post- and retention tests is not clear. However, the high scores obtained on these tests apparently were due to the corrective feedback which was given during the tests to prevent cumulative errors. This corrective feedback would also account for the retention test means being higher than the posttest means.

All three analyses revealed that the example-only groups required significantly more examples to learn the science than the rule-example groups. This finding also replicated the differences found in the earlier pilot study conducted by the authors. The presentation of the rules reduced the number of examples required to complete the task to almost a minimum. Thus, most Ss in the rule-example groups received only one example for each rule. All of the analyses revealed that the differences on the transfer test were non-significant. This finding was also consistent with the results of the earlier pilot study.

The significant reasoning by treatment interactions found in these studies revealed that the requirement for reasoning may be reduced by providing S with rules in addition to examples. Even though the regression lines cross within the range, the cross-over is spurious since no S received less than ten examples. Therefore, there would be little to gain from assigning high ability Ss to an example-only treatment.

The ability-by-treatment interactions found in these two studies do not replicate those found in the earlier pilot study. In that study, there was no significant reasoning-by-treatment interaction, and the memory-by-treatment interaction was significant. In contrast, the reasoning-by-treatment interactions were significant, and the memory-by-treatment interactions were non-significant in the present studies. In addition to the above differences, the regression line of memory on number of examples for the example-only group had a positive slope in the pilot study, but the corresponding regression lines in the present studies had a negative slope. In other words, as memory scores increased, the number of examples required to complete the task also increased in the pilot study, but in the present study the number of examples decreased as memory increased.

The shifts in the relationships between abilities and treatments from the pilot study to the present studies were apparently due to the revisions made in the task after the pilot study. Therefore, by revising the task, certain variables were manipulated which inadvertently affected the relationships between the abilities and task performance.

On the basis of the results of these studies, it was concluded that a rule-example treatment reduces the requirement for reasoning ability and the number of examples required to reach criterion performance when compared to an example-only treatment. Contrary to the learning-by-discovery hypothesis, an example-only, or discovery, treatment does not produce superior transfer to a higher-order task.

The reasoning-by-treatment interactions obtained in these studies do not conclusively demonstrate that an all-or-none position on learning-by-discovery should be rejected. With this particular task, the rule-example treatment seemed to be superior to the example-only treatment on every performance measure. However, high reasoning Ss in the example-only groups were able to perform as well as the Ss in the rule-example group. The floor effect on the number-of-examples criterion measure made it impossible to determine whether or not an example-only treatment would be more profitable for high-reasoning Ss. By the manipulation of task variables, it is possible to alter the relationship between abilities and task performance. Future aptitude-by-treatment research might be more fruitful if an effort were made to analyze the psychological processes underlying shifts in the relationships between abilities and performance brought about by manipulating task variables, rather than searching for disordinal interactions.

*References*


Bruner, J. S. The art of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1961, 31, 21-32.

Bunderson, C. V. Transfer of mental abilities at different states of practice in the solution of concept problems. (Research Bulletin No. RB-67-20) Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Bunderson, C. V. Aptitude by treatment interaction in designing instruction for a hierarchical learning task. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, Feb., 1969.

Bunderson, C. V., Olivier, W. P., & Merrill, P. F. The design of an abstract hierarchical learning task for computer-based instructional research. Technical Report No. 2, Contract ONR N00014-67-A-0126-0006, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Computer-Assisted Instruction Laboratory, The University of Texas at Austin, 1971.

Cronbach, L. J. The logic of experiments on discovery. In L. S. Shulman & E. R. Keislar (Eds.), *Learning by discovery: A critical appraisal*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966, pp. 77-92.

Cronbach, L. J., & Snow, R. E. Individual differences in learning ability as a function of instructional variables. Final Report, U.S. Office of Education, Contract OEC-4-6-061269-1217. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University, March 1969.

Dunham, J. L., & Bunderson, C. V. Effect of decision-rule instruction upon the relationship of cognitive abilities to performance in multiple-category concept problems. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1969, 60, 2, 121-125.

Dunham, J. L., Guilford, J. P., & Hoepfner, R. Multivariate approaches to discovering the intellectual components of concept learning. *Psychological Review*, 1968, 75, 206-221.

French, J. W., Ekstrom, R. B., & Price, L. A. *Manual kit of reference tests for cognitive factors*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

Gagné, R. M., & Paradise, N. E. Abilities and learning sets in knowledge acquisition. *Psychological Monographs*, 1961, 75, No. 518.

Merrill, M. D. Transfer effects within a hierarchical task as a function of review and correction on successive parts. Technical Report No. 5, NONR Contract 3985(04). Urbana, Illinois: Training Research Laboratory, 1964.

Shulman, L. S., & Keislar, E. R. (Eds.) *Learning by discovery: A critical appraisal*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Wittrock, M. C. The learning by discovery hypothesis. In L. S. Shulman & E. R. Keislar (Eds.), *Learning by discovery: A critical appraisal*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966, pp. 33-75.

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

PERSONNEL AND TRAINING RESEARCH PROGRAMS (Code 458)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

NAVY

4 Chief of Naval Research
Code 458
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
495 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
219 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604

1 Director
ONR Branch Office
1030 East Green Street
Pasadena, California 91101

6 Director, Naval Research Laboratory
Attn: Library, Code 2029(ONRL)
Washington, D. C. 20390

1 Office of Naval Research
Area Office
207 West Summer Street
New York, New York 10011

1 Office of Naval Research
Area Office
1076 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94103

6 Director
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, D. C. 20390
Attn: Technical Information Division

20 Defense Documentation Center
Cameron Station, Building 5
5010 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

1 Commanding Officer
Service School Command
U. S. Naval Training Center
San Diego, California 92133

3 Commanding Officer
Naval Personnel & Training Research Lab.
San Diego, California 92152

1 Office in Charge
Naval Medical Neuropsychiatric Research Unit
San Diego, California 92152

1 Commanding Officer
Naval Air Technical Training Center
Jacksonville, Florida 32213

1 Dr. James J. Regan
Naval Training Device Center
Orlando, Florida 32813

1 Chief, Aviation Psychology Division
Naval Aerospace Medical Institute
Naval Aerospace Medical Center
Pensacola, Florida 32512

1 Chief, Naval Air Reserve Training
Naval Air Station
Box 1
Glenview, Illinois 60026

1 Technical Library
U. S. Naval Weapons Laboratory
Dahlgren, Virginia 22448

1 Chairman
Leadership/Management Committee
Naval Sciences Department
U. S. Naval Academy
Annapolis, Maryland 21402

1 Dr. A. L. Slafkosky
Scientific Advisor
Commandant of the Marine Corps
(Code AX)
Washington, D. C. 20380

1 Behavioral Sciences Department
Naval Medical Research Institute
National Naval Medical Center
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

1 Commanding Officer
Naval Medical Field Research Laboratory
Camp Lejeune, North Carolina 28542

1 Chief, Naval Air Technical Training
Naval Air Station
Memphis, Tennessee 38115

1 LCDR J. C. Meredith, USN (Ret.)
Institute of Library Research
University of California, Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

1 Office of Civilian Manpower Management
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20350
Attn: Code 023

1 Chief of Naval Operations, Op-07TL
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20350

1 Chief of Naval Material (MAT 031M)
Room 1323, Main Navy Building
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Naval Ship Systems Command, Code 03H
Department of the Navy
Main Navy Building
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Chief
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
Code 513
Washington, D. C. 20390

9 Technical Library
Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers-11b)
Department of the Navy
Washington, D. C. 20370

3 Director
Personnel Research & Development Lab.
Washington Navy Yard, Building 200
Washington, D. C. 20390

1 Commander, Naval Air Systems Command
Navy Department, AIR-4133
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Commandant of the Marine Corps
Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps
Code A01B
Washington, D. C. 20380

1 Mr. Joseph B. Blakenheim
NAVELEX 0474
Munitions Building, Rm. 3721
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Commander
Operational Test & Evaluation Force
U. S. Naval Base
Norfolk, Virginia 23511

1 Technical Library
Naval Training Device Center
Orlando, Florida 32813

1 Technical Library
Naval Ship Systems Command
Main Navy Building, Rm. 1532
Washington, D. C. 20360

1 Technical Library
Naval Ordnance Station
Indian Head, Maryland 20640

1 Naval Ship Engineering Center
Philadelphia Division
Technical Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112

1 Library, Code 0212
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940

1 Technical Reference Library
Naval Medical Research Institute
National Naval Medical Center
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

1 Technical Library
Naval Ordnance Station
Louisville, Kentucky 40214

1 Library
Naval Electronics Laboratory Center
San Diego, California 92152

1 Technical Library
Naval Undersea Warfare Center
3202 E. Foothill Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91107

1 AFHRL (HRTT/Dr. Ross L. Morgan)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Ohio 45433

1 AFHRL (HRO/Dr. Meyer)
Brooks Air Force Base
Texas 78235

1 Mr. Michael Macdonald-Ross
Instructional Systems Associates
West One
49 Welbeck Street
London WIM 7HE
England

1 Commanding Officer
U. S. Naval Schools Command
Mare Island
Vallejo, California 94592

1 Dr. Don C. Coombs, Asst. Director
ERIC Clearinghouse
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California 94305

1 Scientific Advisory Team (Code 71)
Staff, COMASWFORLANT
Norfolk, Virginia 23511

1 ERIC Clearinghouse
Educational Media and Technology
Stanford University
Stanford, California

1 ERIC Clearinghouse
Vocational and Technical Education
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43212

1 Educational & Training Developments Staff
Personnel Research & Development Lab
Building 200, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D.C. 20390

ARMY

1 Human Resources Research Office
Division #6, Aviation
Post Office Box 428
Fort Rucker, Alabama 36360

1 Human Resources Research Office
Division #3, Recruit Training
Post Office Box 5787
Presidio of Monterey, California 93940
Attn: Library

1 Human Resources Research Office
Division #4, Infantry
Post Office Box 2086
Fort Benning, Georgia 31905

1 Department of the Army
U.S. Army Adjutant General School
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. 46216
Attn: AGCS-EA

1 Director of Research
U.S. Army Armor Human Research Unit
Fort Knox, Kentucky 40121
Attn: Library

1 Research Analysis Corporation
McLean, Virginia 22101
Attn: Library

1 Human Resources Research Office
Division #5, Air Defense
Post Office Box 6021
Fort Bliss, Texas 79916

1 Human Resources Research Office
Division #1, Systems Operations
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

1 Director
Human Resources Research Office
The George Washington University
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

1 Armed Forces Staff College
Norfolk, Virginia 23511
Attn: Library

1 Chief
Training and Development Division
Office of Civilian Personnel
Department of the Army
Washington, D. C. 20310

1 U.S. Army Behavioral Science Research Laboratory
Washington, D. C. 20315

1 Walter Reed Army Institute of Research
Walter Reed Army Medical Center
Washington, D. C. 20012

1 Behavioral Sciences Division
Office of Chief of Research and Development
Department of the Army
Washington, D. C. 20310

AIR FORCE

1 Director
Air University Library
Maxwell Air Force Base
Alabama 36112
Attn: AUL-8110

1 Cadet Registrar
U.S. Air Force Academy
Colorado 80840

1 Headquarters, ESD
ESVPT
L. G. Hanscom Field
Bedford, Massachusetts 01731
Attn: Dr. Mayer

1 AFHRL (HRT/Dr. G. A. Ekstrand)
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base
Ohio 45433

1 Commandant
U. S. Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine
Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235
Attn: Aeromedical Library (SMSDL)

1 6570th Personnel Research Laboratory
Aerospace Medical Division
Lackland Air Force Base
San Antonio, Texas 78236

Distribution List (Cont'd)

1 AFOSR (SRLB)
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

1 Research Psychologist
SCBB, Headquarters
Air Force Systems Command
Andrews Air Force Base
Washington, D. C. 20331

1 Headquarters, U. S. Air Force
Chief, Analysis Division (AFPDPL)
Washington, D. C. 20330

1 Headquarters, U. S. Air Force
Washington, D. C. 20330
Attn: AFPTRTB

1 Headquarters, U. S. Air Force
AFRDDG
Room 1D373, The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20330

1 Headquarters, USAF (AFPTRD)
Training Devices and Instructional Technology Division
Washington, D. C. 20330

MISCELLANEOUS

1 Dr. Alvin E. Goins
Executive Secretary
Personality & Cognition Research Review Committee
Behavioral Sciences Research Branch
National Institute of Mental Health
5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Room 10All
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20203

1 Dr. Mats Bjorkman
University of Umea
Department of Psychology
Umea 6, Sweden

1 Technical Information Exchange
Center for Computer Sciences and Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Washington, D. C. 20234

1 Director
Defense Atomic Support Agency
Washington, D. C. 20305
Attn: Technical Library

1 Executive Secretariat
Interagency Committee on Manpower Research
Room 515
1738 "M" Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(Attn: Mrs. Ruth Relyea)

1 Mr. Joseph J. Cowan
Chief, Personnel Research Branch
U. S. Coast Guard Headquarters
PO-1, Station 3-12
1300 "E" Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20226

1 Mr. Edmund C. Berkeley
Information International, Inc.
545 Technology Square
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

1 Dr. Donald L. Bitzer
Computer-Based Education Research Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

1 Dr. C. Victor Bunderson
Computer-Assisted Instruction Lab.
University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

1 Dr. F. J. DiVesta
Education & Psychology Center
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

1 Dr. Philip H. DuBois
Department of Psychology
Washington University
Lindell & Skinker Boulevards
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

1 Dr. Wallace Feurzeig
Bolt, Beranek & Newman, Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

1 Dr. Robert Glaser
Learning Research & Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

1 Dr. J. P. Guilford
University of Southern California
3551 University Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90007

1 Dr. Duncan N. Hansen
Center for Computer Assisted Instruction
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

1 Dr. Albert E. Hickey
Entelek, Incorporated
42 Pleasant Street
Newburyport, Massachusetts 01950

1 Dr. Howard H. Kendler
Department of Psychology
University of California
Santa Barbara, California 93106

1 Dr. Robert R. Mackie
Human Factors Research, Inc.
6780 Cortona Drive
Santa Barbara Research Park
Goleta, California 93107

1 Dr. Gabriel D. Ofiesh
Center for Educational Technology
Catholic University
4001 Harewood Road, N.E.
Washington, D. C. 20017

1 Dr. Joseph W. Rigney
Behavioral Technology Laboratories
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, California 90007

1 Dr. Arthur I. Siegel
Applied Psychological Services
Science Center
404 East Lancaster Avenue
Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087

1 Dr. Lawrence M. Stolurow
Harvard Computing Center
6 Appian Way
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

1 Dr. Benton J. Underwood
Department of Psychology
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois 60201

1 Dr. Joseph A. Van Campen
Institute for Math Studies in the Social Sciences
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

1 Dr. John Annett
Department of Psychology
Hull University
Yorkshire
England

Distribution List (cont'd)

1 Dr. M. C. Shelesnyak
Interdisciplinary Communications Program
Smithsonian Institution
1025 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005

1 Dr. Lee J. Cronbach
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

1 Dr. John C. Flanagan
Applied Institutes for Research
P.O. Box 1113
Palo Alto, California 94302

1 Dr. M. D. Havron
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
Westgate Industrial Park
7710 Old Springhouse Road
McLean, Virginia 22101

1 Dr. Roger A. Kaufman
Department of Education
Institute of Instructional System
Technology & Research
Chapman College
Orange, California 92666

1 Dr. Carl E. Helm
Department of Educational Psychology
Graduate Center
City University of New York
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

1 S. Fisher, Research Associate
Computer Facility
Graduate Center
City University of New York
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

1 LT COL F. R. Ratliff
Office of the Assistant
Secretary of Defense (M&RU)
Room 3D960, The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20350

1 Mr. Luigi Petrullo
2431 North Edgewood Street
Arlington, Virginia 22207

1 Institute for Defense Analysis
400 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202

3 Director, ARPA Agency
The Pentagon
Washington, D. C. 20301

1 Dr. Morton Bertin
Office of Naval Research
219 South Dearborn
Chicago, Illinois 60604

1 Dr. Victor Fields
Director of Personnel & Training
Programs
Office of Naval Research
Washington, D. C. 20301

1 Dr. Glenn Bryon
Director
Psychological Research Division
Office of Naval Research
Washington, D. C. 20301

1 Mr. Frank Lucas
ONR Representative
Main Building 2506
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

1 Dr. George Lawrence
Deputy Director
Behavioral Sciences Division
Advanced Research Projects Agency
Department of Defense
Washington, D. C. 20301